

### Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated February 23, 2009, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. Claims 1, 20, 26 and 30 have been amended. No new matter was added. Claims 21-25 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

### Claim Objections

Claims 1, 20, 21, 26 and 30 are objected to because the claims are deemed by the Office Action as “marred with hard-to-construe repetition of terms like first input instruction, outgoing instruction, incoming instructions, second user input instruction, the system output instructions, outgoing instruction, incoming instructions, incoming software object, [and] second operating system.” Applicants respectfully disagree with the general assertion of the Office Action and requests that the Examiner provide specifics regarding the particular claims and the terms recited by each claim that are objected to. Applicants further request that the Examiner provide a clear rationale for the objection of each claim.

### 112 Rejections

Claims 1, 6-10 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action contends that the specification fails to support the claim 1 recitation, “translating the at least one XML item into a user input instruction of a second operating system on the second computer that instructs the second operating system to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer.” In particular, the Office Action alleges that “the specification fails to support a ‘user input’ instruction of the second operating system executes an instruction equivalent to receiving a user input at a input peripheral device of the second computer.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees and contends that the claim recitation is supported by the specification. Paragraph 39 of the specification describes that a keyboard input comprising the depression of the “enter” key may be formatted as a combination of XML tags at a client computer. The combination of XML tags is described in paragraph 41 as being communicated to

a remote access server and being translated into native instructions for an “enter” key compression in the OS of the remote access server. One skilled in the art, at the time of filing, would know that an “enter” key compression under normal operation of a computer would be received by an input peripheral device of the computer from a user (the user hitting the enter key at the keyboard) and thus equivalent to receiving user input at the peripheral device. Therefore, the native instruction for an “enter” key compression in the OS of the remote access server supports, “a user input instruction ... that instructs the second operating system to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer.”

Hence, the feature of claim 1 is supported by the specification and Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection. Claims 6-10 and 12 are rejected due to their dependency on claim 1 and thus Applicant further requests withdrawal of the rejection of these claims on the same basis.

Claims 20, 28 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action contends that the specification fails to support the claim 20 recitation, “wherein the second non-proprietary data script is translated into a system output instruction in the first computer language by referencing the database to match contents of the second non-proprietary script to instructions in the first computer language.” This recitation of this particular feature has been removed from the claim. Claims 28 and 30 stand rejected due to their dependency on claim 20. Thus, the 112 rejection against claims 20, 28 and 30 is moot and may be withdrawn.

Claims 21-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 21-25 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and thus the rejection is moot.

Claims 26 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office Action contends that the specification fails to support the claim 26 recitation, “receiving data from the second operating system ... creating data defining a second object ... by referencing the second database.” This particular recitation has been removed from the claim. Claim 29 stands rejected due to its dependency on claim 26. Thus, the 112 rejection against claims 26 and 29 is moot and may be withdrawn.

### 102 Rejections

Claims 1, 6-10, 12 and 20-30 stand rejected as being anticipated by Salmenkaita (U.S. Patent App. 2004/0176958). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections to the extent that they apply to the currently pending claims.

### Claims 1, 6-10 and 12

Applicant respectfully submits that Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites, “executing the user input instruction on the second computer that instructs the second operating system to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer.”

The Office Action contends that Salmenkaita describes receiving a user input on a first computer and executing a user input instruction on a second computer that instructs the operating system of the second computer to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer. However, Salmenkaita fails to describe an instruction that instructs the operating system of the second computer to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer.

Salmenkaita describes a method and system for facilitating user access to services provided by a server via a wireless device. The Office Action refers to [0167] of Salmenkaita as describing the above cited feature of claim 1. Paragraph 167 of Salmenkaita describes a user at the wireless device selecting an option to request recommendations from the server. A user selects the option by inputting a voice command into the wireless device. The wireless device transmits a request message to the server via an XML file including the op code “RQ\_REC\_3” that designates the message as a recommendation request message. The server receives the request, interprets the op code “RQ\_REC\_3” with an op code parser, and upon interpreting the op code, the server determines recommendations from a database to transmit to the wireless device.

As mentioned above, Salmenkaita fails to describe an instruction on the second computer that instructs the second operating system to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer. In the description provided by Salmenkaita, the voice command received by the wireless device from the user is a user input. The wireless device creates a recommendation request message and transmits the message to the

server as a result of receiving the voice command. The server receives the recommendation request message, determines recommendations and transmits the recommendations to the wireless device due to receipt of the request. The server does not create or transmit a recommendation request as a result of receiving the recommendation request from the wireless device as the receipt of the voice command on the wireless device causes the wireless device to perform.

Thus, the server receiving the request from the wireless device, determining recommendations and transmitting the recommendations fails to describe an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input (voice command) at an input peripheral device of the server since the creating and transmitting of a recommendation request is not equivalent to determining and transmitting recommendations. This is in contrast to claim 1 which recites, “the user input instruction ... that instructs the second operating system to execute an instruction equivalent to receiving the user input at an input peripheral device of the second computer.”

The Office Action also recites that the feature recited by claim 1 is given no patentable weight due to the feature not being supported by the specification. However, as shown in the response to the 112 rejection, the feature recited by claim 1 is supported by the specification and thus should be given patentable weight.

Therefore, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 1 such that claim 1 is allowable over Salmenkaita. Claims 1, 6-10 and 12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Claims 20, 28 and 30

Applicant respectfully submits that Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 20. For example, claim 20 recites, “a first non-proprietary data script that provides instructions to the second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the user input received via a first user interface of the first computer.”

The Office Action contends that Salmenkaita describes a data script that provides instructions to the second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the user input received via a first user interface of the first computer. However, Salmenkaita fails to describe providing instructions to the second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the user input received via the first computer.

Salmenkaita describes a method and system for facilitating user access to services provided by a server via a wireless device. The Office Action refers to [0167] of Salmenkaita as describing the above cited feature of claim 20. Paragraph 167 of Salmenkaita describes a user at the wireless device selecting an option to request recommendations from the server. A user selects the option by inputting a voice command into the wireless device. The wireless device transmits a request message to the server via an XML file including the op code “RQ\_REC\_3” that designates the message as a recommendation request message. The server receives the request, interprets the op code “RQ\_REC\_3” with an op code parser, and upon interpreting the op code, the server determines recommendations from a database to transmit to the wireless device.

As mentioned above, Salmenkaita fails to describe providing instructions to the second computer to execute instructions corresponding to the user input received via the first computer. In the description provided by Salmenkaita, the voice command received by the wireless device from the user is a user input. The wireless device creates a recommendation request message and transmits the message to the server as a result of receiving the voice command. The server receives the recommendation request message, determines recommendations and transmits the recommendations to the wireless device due to receipt of the request. The server does not create or transmit a recommendation request as a result of receiving the recommendation request from the wireless device as the receipt of the voice command on the wireless device causes the wireless device to perform.

Thus, the server receiving the request from the wireless device, determining recommendations and transmitting the recommendations fails to describe the execution of instructions that correspond to receiving the user input (voice command) received by the wireless device since the creating and transmitting of a recommendation request is not equivalent to determining and transmitting recommendations. This is in contrast to claim 20 which recites, “wherein the second user input instruction corresponds to the first user input received via the first user interface of the first computer.”

Therefore, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 20 such that claim 20 is allowable over Salmenkaita. Claims 28 and 30 depend from claim 20 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 20.

### Claims 26-30

Applicant respectfully submits that Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature recited by claim 26. For example, claim 26 recites, “executing the second user input instruction by the second computer, wherein the second user input instruction corresponds to the first user input received via the first user interface of the first computer.”

The Office Action contends that Salmenkaita describes executing a second user input instruction on the second computer where the second user input instruction corresponds to the first user input received via the first user interface of the first computer. Salmenkaita describes a method and system for facilitating user access to services provided by a server via a wireless device. Salmenkaita further describes a user at the wireless device selecting an option to request recommendations from the server. A user selects the option by inputting a voice command into the wireless device. The wireless device transmits a request message to the server via an XML file including the op code “RQ\_REC\_3” that designates the message as a recommendation request message. The server receives the request, interprets the op code “RQ\_REC\_3” with an op code parser, and upon interpreting the op code, the server determines recommendations from a database to transmit to the wireless device.

The Office Action does not specifically address how Salmenkaita describes the particular feature recited by claim 26 but rather refers back to the rejection of claim 1. Applicant notes, however, that Claim 1 does not recite this feature such that the rejection of claim 1 does not support a rejection of this feature of claim 26. Applicant is left to conclude that the Office Action is alleging that the server determining recommendations due to receiving the request with the op code describes the particular feature of claim 26. However, the server determining recommendations for a user does not describe execution of a second user input instruction at the server that corresponds to a first user input instruction received via a first user interface of a first computer.

In the description provided by Salmenkaita, the voice command received by the wireless device from the user is a user input. The wireless device creates a recommendation request message and transmits the message to the server as a result of receiving the voice command. The server receives the recommendation request message, determines recommendations and transmits the recommendations to the wireless device due to receipt of the request. The server does not create or transmit a recommendation request as a result of receiving the

recommendation request from the wireless device as the receipt of the voice command on the wireless device causes the wireless device to perform.

Thus, the server receiving the request from the wireless device, determining recommendations and transmitting the recommendations fails to describe the execution of a second user input instruction that corresponds to a first user input instruction (voice command) received via a first computer (the wireless device). The second user input instruction cannot correspond to the first user input instruction since determining and transmitting recommendations is not equivalent to the creating and transmitting of a recommendation request. The actions of the wireless device and server may be related to each other but they do not correspond to each other. This is in contrast to claim 26 which recites, “wherein the second user input instruction corresponds to the first user input received via the first user interface of the first computer.”

Therefore, Salmenkaita fails to describe each and every feature of claim 26 such that claim 26 is allowable over Salmenkaita. Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 26.

### Conclusion

Applicant asserts that the application including claims 1, 6-10, 12 and 26-30 are in condition for allowance. Applicant requests that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 7, 2009

/Daniel J. Layden/  
Daniel J. Layden  
Reg. No. 60,921

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, GA 30007-1355  
(770) 643-8912